UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,348	10/20/2003	Stephan Grunow	TI-36564 4206	
	7590 09/20/200 LUMENTS INCORPO	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 6554		MOVVA, AMAR		
DALLAS, TX 75265			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2891		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/20/2007	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/689,348	GRUNOW ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Amar Movva	2891	

	Amar Movva	2891	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 6_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENIAMENTS.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further complete (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belomonto) They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a complete (See 37 CER 1116 and 41 33(a))	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below);	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	:·	·	
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  .		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ls to provide a l).
<ul> <li>10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but</li> </ul>		·	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
•			1

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding applicant's arguments that claims 1-18 do not constitute new matter under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, applicant states that portions of the specification, namely pg. 8 lines 4-17 provide the basis to overcome the new matter rejection. This arugement is not persuasive. Examiner notes that applicant's independent claims state that the first contiguous barrier layer (70) is formed to thickness X1 over said upper surface (35) of the low K dielectric layer (20) within the trench and X2 on the sidewalls of the trench, wherein the ratio of X1 to X2 is 3:2. The applicable standard for determination of an instance of new matter is that the new claim matter is neither expressly or inherently disclosed.

Regarding the lack of express disclosure, Applicant's specification discloses a 3:2 ratio vis a vis X1:X2, wherein X1 refers to the barrier layer (70) on the upper surfaces (35) of the low K dielectric outside of the trench (see e.g. fig. 2a) and X2 is thickness on the sidewalls of the trench, thus applicant's disclosure only supplies support that the barrier layer is formed to a thickness X1 (ratio 3:2) outside of the trench. While it is possible to, in view of fig. 2a, to find support in applicant's disclosure that a portion of the contiguous barrier layer (70) is thicker in the trench than on the sidewalls of the trench it is not sufficient to support a claim that the ratio of X1 to X2 is 3:2 with X1 in the trench.

Furthermore disclosure does not inherhely show a 3:2 ratio since issues that would cause the thicker portion of 70 in the trench vis a vis thicker portion outside of the trench to vary (in PVD and CVD as specified in the specification as the methedology of depositing layer 70) would be poor step coverage depending on the specific materials of the deposition, a lack of knowledge as to what angles were used in the deposition, and whether or not the deposition may have had multiple steps with masks to isolate certain areas for deposition.

PLEASE NOTE: A new examiner, Amar Movva, has been assigned to this case. Applicant is advised to note the new contact information for the examiner:

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amar Movva whose telephone number is 571-272-9009. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bradley Baumeister can be reached on 571-272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571- 273-8300

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2888